

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims Amendments/Status

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the present application. By way of this reply, claims 1, 7, and 14 have been amended to clarify claim language and correct informalities. No new matter has been introduced through these amendments.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the specification because of informalities. The title has been amended to correct a typographical error. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,804,532 ("Moon"). This rejection is traversed for the reasons presented below.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, "the second step of comparing the link quality calculated at the first step with *a first reference value preset in connection with the WLAN*" and "the fifth step of switching a mode of the mobile communication terminal ... if it is determined that *the link quality of the portable Internet ... is higher than a second reference value*" (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully notes that according to one or more embodiments, the link quality of the portable Internet is calculated and compared with a reference value, and its result affects the decision of whether to perform a handoff. In other words, not only the link quality of the WLAN is considered, but also that of the portable Internet is a factor in deciding whether to perform a handoff. For example, handoff to the portable Internet may be conducted if the link quality of the portable Internet is higher than *a second reference value* regardless of whether or not the link

quality of the WLAN is higher than *the second reference value*. Advantageously, more flexibility can be given to handoff schemes according to one or more embodiment because the link quality of a portable Internet network is also taken into account. For instance, a handoff from a primary network to a secondary network having a larger coverage area than the primary network can be made even if the link quality of the secondary network is lower than that of the primary network as long as the link quality of the secondary network is higher than a secondary reference value.

Moon relates to a system for routing communications based on wireless communication link quality. On pages 2-3 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that all of the steps recited in claim 1 are disclosed in col. 13, line 14 – col. 15, line 10 and Figs. 2, 4, and 5 of Moon. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Moon does not show or suggest at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 1 for the following reasons.

Referring to Fig. 5, Moon shows that at step 182, it is determined whether the link quality of the *primary* communication link is below a high quality threshold and, at step 188, it is determined whether the link quality of the *primary* communication link is below a low quality threshold. Depending on the result of these determinations, a handoff may or may not be made. However, it is *not* determined whether the link quality of an *alternative* communication link is below either the high or low quality threshold. That is, Moon does not show or suggest a handoff scheme where a handoff decision is made depending upon whether the link quality of an *alternative* link is above or below a reference value in connection with the alternative link.

In addition, amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, “the third step of measuring a signal from a portable Internet having coverage wider than that of the current communication network,” “the fourth step of calculating link quality of the portable Internet,” and “the fifth step of switching a mode of the mobile communication terminal to perform handoff to the portable Internet if it is determined that the link quality of the portable Internet calculated at the fourth step is higher than a second reference value.” As explained above, Moon merely describes that a router selects an alternative communication link if the link quality of the primary communication link is below the low link quality threshold (step 188). Therefore, Moon is completely unrelated to receiving a signal from a portable Internet network having coverage wider than the WLAN and

performing handoff to the portable Internet if the link quality of the received portable Internet is higher than a second reference value. As such, Moon fails to show or teach at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 1.

Independent claim 7 recites, in part, “the first step of measuring a signal from a WLAN having coverage narrower than that of *a portable Internet in which the mobile communication terminal is currently located*” and “the fourth step of switching a mode of the mobile communication terminal to perform handoff to the WLAN if, as a result of the comparing at the third step, the link quality of the WLAN is higher than the first reference value, *regardless of whether or not link quality of the portable Internet is higher than the first reference value*” (emphasis added). According to one or more embodiment, a handoff may be performed depending upon the link quality of an alternative network, regardless of that of the primary network.

Moon describes with reference to Fig. 5 that a handoff is made from the primary communication link to an alternative communication link. As discussed above, however, Moon merely discloses that handoff is made only depending upon the link quality of the primary communication link. The link quality of alternative communication links is not compared with either the high or low quality threshold.

Further, amended independent claim 7 recites, in part, “the third step of comparing the link quality of the WLAN signal ... with a preset first reference value” and “the fourth step of switching a mode of the mobile communication terminal to perform handoff to the WLAN if ... the link quality of the WLAN is higher than the first reference value.”

As explained above, however, Moon merely describes in Fig. 5 and col. 13-15 that another communication link is selected if the link quality of the primary communication link is below a high link quality threshold or a low link quality threshold. Thus, Moon is unrelated to receiving a signal from a WLAN having coverage narrower than that of a portable Internet and performing handoff to the WLAN if the link quality of the WLAN is higher than a first reference value. As such, Moon fails to show or teach at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 7.

Independent claim 14 recites, in part, “the third step of comparing *the link quality of the*

WLAN signal ... with a preset first reference value” and “the sixth step of switching a mode of the mobile communication terminal to perform handoff to the portable Internet if *the link quality of the portable Internet ... is higher than a second reference value*” (emphasis added). As discussed with respect to claim 1, Moon merely describes that a handoff is made only depending on whether the link quality of the *primary* communication link is above or below the high and low quality threshold. As such, Moon fails to show or teach at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 14.

In view of the above, independent claims 1, 7, and 14 are patentable over Moon. Also, the respective dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 14. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

By: /Yoon S. Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314
Direct Phone (703) 535-7340
Facsimile (703) 518-5499
Date: May 27, 2009